



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/994,846	11/28/2001	Mika Sugimoto	FJ-2001-030-US	8448
21254 7590 01/22/2007 MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PLLC 8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD SUITE 200 VIENNA, VA 22182-3817			EXAMINER ZHOU, TING	
			ART UNIT 2173	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE			MAIL DATE	
3 MONTHS			01/22/2007	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/994,846

Applicant(s)

SUGIMOTO, MIKA

Examiner

Ting Zhou

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The amendment filed on 10 October 2006 have been received and entered. The applicant added new claims 21-29. Claims 1-29 as amended are pending in the application.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claims 1-16 and 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Independent claims 1 and 8 claim a "tool", which is software per se, and software claimed by itself, without being executed or implemented on a computer medium, is intangible. Claims 1 and 8 define a tool embodying functional descriptive material. However, the claims do not define a computer-readable medium or memory and is thus non-statutory for that reason (i.e., when functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized). That is, the scope of the presently claimed tool can range from paper on which a program is written, to a program simply contemplated and memorized by a person. Claims 2-7, 9-16 and 21-26 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 8, respectively.

Art Unit: 2173

3. To expedite a complete examination of the instant application, the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 (nonstatutory) above are further rejected as set forth below in anticipation of the applicant amending these claims to place them within the four statutory categories of invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1-16 and 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 1-16 and 21-26 recite a homepage creation and update “tool”. However, the applicant’s specification does not provide a description of the “tool”; absent a positive recitation of what the “tool” is, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to determine if the tool is a computer program, a graphical user interface, a processor, etc. Therefore, the specification does not provide an adequate basis for the recitation of the “homepage creation and update tool”.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 2173

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 3-4, 11, 17-20 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 3 recites the limitation "the arranging" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 4 recites the limitation "the photographing information" in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 11 recites the limitation "the photographing information" in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 17 recites the limitations "the beginning" and "the camera", in lines 11 and 14, respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claims 18-20 are dependent upon claim 17 and are rejected for similar reasons.

Claim 18 recites the limitation "said automatically arranging" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 19 recites the limitation "the arranging" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 27 recites the limitation "the beginning" in line 12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claims 28-29 are dependent upon claim 27 and are rejected for similar reasons.

Claim 28 recites the limitation "the beginning" (from claim 27) and the limitation "said homepages" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 29 depends upon claim 28 and is rejected for similar reasons.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

6. Claims 1-29 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 101 and 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The present invention teaches a homepage creation and update tool that allows users to select desired displayed images to indicate a homepage creation or update using the selected images. Each of the independent claims identifies the distinct feature of "when the user selects a plurality of desired images and indicates beginning of the homepage creation process, the selected images are sequentially presented individually in a predetermined order to said user to add comments before a homepage format of said image is generated that will automatically place said image into said selected layout format, if a new homepage is being created, or into an existing homepage layout, if an existing homepage is being updated". The closest prior art, Parker, in the book, The Complete Idiot's Guide to Microsoft FrontPage 2000 (hereinafter "Parker") teaches a homepage creation and update program (Microsoft FrontPage 2000) that causes a computer to execute the functions of displaying a plurality of stored images and allowing the user to select a desired image (displaying a plurality of files, such as clip art images, for users to import into a

Art Unit: 2173

webpage) (pages 88-91), allowing the user to indicate a beginning of a homepage creation process (users can create a new website, or update a website by using the FrontPage creator/editor to save and publish pages) (pages 15-16, 25 and 107), automatically performing the one of the creation and the update of a homepage using the desired image after the desired image is selected and the beginning of the homepage creation process is indicated by the user (after the user has added or edited a selected image, FrontPage will automatically create or update the page when the user selects the options to save the changes made to the website and upload and publish the newly added or edited images, pages etc.) (pages 26-27, 107 and 297-300); and arranging, when the user selects a plurality of desired images and indicates beginning of the homepage creation process, the selected plurality of images, automatically, according to image information stored in each image file by a camera (after the user has inserted or edited a selected image with corresponding image information stored in the image file, i.e. properties such as image width, height, direction, etc. in "Picture Properties", and selected the option to save and upload/publish the newly added or edited images to the web page, the web page is automatically created/updated with the images arranged in the user selected fashion, i.e. the size, height, placement, etc. of the images of the published website corresponds to the user edited "Picture Properties" information of the image; user can select images from a digital camera to be imported/uploaded into the webpage) (pages 26-27, 91-96, 102-107 and 297-300). However, the prior art fails to teach when the user selects a plurality of desired images and indicates beginning of the homepage creation process, the selected images are sequentially presented individually in a predetermined order to the user to allow the user to add comments before a homepage format of the image is generated that will automatically place the image into the selected layout format,

Art Unit: 2173

if a new homepage is being created, or into an existing homepage layout, if an existing being updated; in other words, the prior art fails to teach allowing a user to merely select images, and the tool will sequentially present these selected images so that the user can make comments for each image, and by only one additional command, the tool will then automatically generate the HTML code to place the image into the format of a new homepage or into the format of an existing homepage. Therefore, the prior art fails to anticipate or render the above limitations obvious.

### *Response to Arguments*

8. Applicant's arguments filed 10 October 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant stated that the claims have been amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection, however, the examiner respectfully argues that the "tool" recited in claims 1-16 and 21-26 can still be software per se; the specification of the instant application does not provide a definition of what the "tool" is, and therefore the tool could simply be a computer program, which is software per se.

MPEP 2106.01 reads as follows:

Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material." In this context, "functional descriptive material" consists of data structures and computer programs which impart functionality when employed as a computer component. (The definition of "data structure" is "a physical or logical relationship among data elements, designed to support specific data manipulation functions." The New IEEE Standard Dictionary of Electrical and Electronics Terms 308 (5th ed. 1993).) "Nonfunctional descriptive material" includes but is not limited to music, literary works and a compilation or mere arrangement of data.

When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (claim to data structure stored on a computer readable medium that increases



Art Unit: 2173

computer efficiency held statutory) and Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1360-61, 31 USPQ2d at 1759 (claim to computer having a specific data structure stored in memory held statutory product-by-process claim) with Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory).

In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is a computer element which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory. See Lowry, 32 F.3d at 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d at 1035. However, claims 1-16 and 21-26 do not define a computer-readable medium or memory and is thus non-statutory for that reason (i.e., the tool is not embodied on a computer storage device that allows the functionality of the tool to be realized). The examiner respectfully maintains that claims 1-16 and 21-26 are non-statutory.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ting Zhou whose telephone number is (571) 272-4058. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached at (571) 272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Art Unit: 2173

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TZ

*Kieu Vu*

Kieu Vu

Primary Examiner